UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/784,352	02/16/2001	Joerg Heuer	1454.1012	2838

21171   7590   09/10/2004

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER
CHEN, CHONGSHAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2172	

DATE MAILED: 09/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/784,352	HEUER, JOERG
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Chongshan Chen	2172	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _18 May 2004_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1,2,4-13,15-22,34,36 and 38-40_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1,2,4-13,15-22,34,36 and 38-40_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to amendment filed on 18 May 2004. Claims 3, 14, 23-33, 35

and 37 are canceled, and claims 1-2, 4-13, 15-22, 34, 36 and 38-40 are pending.

Claim Objections

2.   Claim 16 is objected to because of the following informalities: claim 16 is depend on

canceled claim 14. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the
> subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4.   Claims 1-2, 4-13, 15-22, 34, 36 and 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second

paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject

matter which applicant regards as the invention.

5.   The term "special descriptor" in claims 1-2, 4-13, 15-22, 34, 36 and 38-40 are an abstract

term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "special descriptor" is not defined by the

claim, the specification does not provide a concrete definition for the term, and one of ordinary

skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the definition of the term.

6.   Claims 1-2, 4-13, 15-22, 34, 36 and 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second

paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential elements and steps. It is unclear what is

the reference logic, and what is in the reference logic. Is it a code, or a link, or something else?

What is a special descriptor? What is the difference between the special descriptor and the

standard descriptor? How is the special descriptor computed from the standard descriptor, and vice versa?

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8.   Claims 1-2, 4-13, 15-22, 34, 36 and 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown et al. ("Brown", US 6,397,325).

As per claim 1, Brown teaches a method for querying a database with database contents with a database structure comprising:

placing a query in a query structure (Brown, col. 8, lines 55-67);

wherein the query structure and the database structure reference a standard structure with a reference logic (Brown, Fig. 4, col. 6, lines 49-57, alias table)

wherein the reference logic is one of: transmitted together with the query; at least partially transmitted together with the query; present in the database; and partially present in the database (Brown, Fig. 2, col. 6, lines 49-57),

wherein the standard structure is described by standard descriptors, and the query structure and the database structure are described by at least one of the standard descriptors and more special descriptors, wherein the more special descriptors reference the standard descriptors with the reference logic (Brown, Fig. 2 & 4, col. 6, line 49 – col. 7, line 30, col. 8, lines 55-67).

Brown does not explicitly disclose the query structure differs from the database structure. However, it is well known that the query structure is in SQL format while the database structure is in table format. It is obvious that the query structure differs from the database structure.

As per claim 2, Brown teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, and further discloses the reference logic is stored in the database (Brown, Fig. 2, col. 6, lines 49-57).

As per claim 4, Brown teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 3, and further discloses standard descriptors present in the query structure are compared with the standard descriptors of the database, wherein identical standard descriptors are evaluated for the query (Brown, col. 6, line 58 – col. 7, line 30).

As per claim 5, Brown teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 3, and further discloses the special descriptors present in the query structure are compared with the special descriptors of the database, wherein identical special descriptors are evaluated for the query (Brown, col. 6, line 58 – col. 7, line 30).

As per claim 6, Brown teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 5, and further discloses dissimilar special descriptors are reviewed to determine whether a computation logic is present in the database, so that a respective special descriptor of the database structure can be computed directly from the corresponding special descriptor of the query structure by means of the computation logic (Brown, col. 6, line 58 – col. 7, line 30).

As per claim 7, Brown teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 6, and further discloses the computation logic is stored in the database (Brown, col. 6, line 58 – col. 7, line 30).

As per claim 8, Brown teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 7, and further discloses for dissimilar special descriptors for which no computation logic is present, a review is made to determine whether a reference logic to standard descriptors is at least partially present in the database (Brown, col. 6, line 58 – col. 7, line 30).

As per claim 9, Brown teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 7, and further discloses for dissimilar special descriptors for which no computation logic and/or no reference logic is present, a review is made to determine whether the reference logic was transmitted together with the query (Brown, col. 6, line 58 – col. 7, line 30, the examiner interprets the and/or as or).

As per claim 10, Brown teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 7, and further discloses atomic elements defining the information and/or link of a special descriptor are used as the computation logic (Brown, col. 6, line 58 – col. 7, line 30, the examiner interprets the and/or as or).

As per claim 11, Brown teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 10, and further discloses the atomic elements used are semantic, physical and linking atomic elements to define the semantic meaning, the physical memory structure, and the link between memory structure and semantics (Brown, col. 6, line 58 – col. 7, line 30, the examiner interprets the and/or as or).

Claims 12-13, 15-22, 34, 36 and 38-40 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claims 1-2 and 4-11.

Conclusion

9.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

Kiyoki et al. (US 6,347,315 B1) teach a method and apparatus for selecting and utilizing

one of computers or databases.

Bodamer et al. (US 6,236,997 B1) teach a method and apparatus for accessing foreign

databases in a heterogeneous database system

Redfern (US 6,078,914 A) teaches a natural language meta-search system and method.

Zander (US 6,453,310 B1) teaches a installable schema for low-overhead databases.

Burdick et al. (US 6,148,307 A) teach a method and system for generating product

performance history.

Hayashi et al. (US 5,742,809 A) teach a database generic composite structure processing

system.

Bosch et al. (US 6,418,428 B1) teach an object-oriented data access and analysis system.

Obendorf (US 6,405,209 B2) teaches a transparent object instantiation/initialization from

a relational store.

Yoshida et al. (US 6,212,518 B1) teach a system and method for retrieval of data from

related databases based upon database association model.

10.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Chongshan Chen whose telephone number is 703-305-8319. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (8:00 am - 4:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John E Breene can be reached on (703)305-9790. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

September 3, 2004

SHAHID ALAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER